85 - 1939

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 24 1986
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

CASE NO. 85-8881

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

IN RE: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN, PRO SE

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

WRIT OF MANDAMUS

MITCHELL E. BRANNEN, PRO SE
4149 COLT RD.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31405
233-6269/ 233-5200

24pp

EDITOR'S NOTE

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE POOR HARD COPY AT THE TIME OF FILMING. IF AND WHEN A BETTER COPY CAN BE OBTAINED, A NEW FICHE WILL BE ISSUED.

PURSUANT TO RULE 21 .1 C

TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW I
LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO PROCEEDINGS
IN THE COURTS WHOSE JUDGEMENT IS SOUGHT
TO BE REVIEWED II AND III
AND IV
REFERENCE TO OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL REPORTS..V
AND VI
STATEMENT TO INVOKE JURISDICTION OF
SUPREME COURT VII, VIII, AND IX
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND REGULATIONS
WHICH CASE INVOLVES X
STATEMENT OF CASE MATERIAL TO THE
CONSIDERATION OF THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED XI
DIRECT AND CONCISE ARGUMENT FOR ALLOWANCE
OF THE WRIT XII - XVI
APPENDIX-PURSUANT TO RULE 21K XVII-XX
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE XXI-XXII

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

CASE NO. 85-8881 (D.C. CASE NO. 485-222)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

I. WHETHER THE COURT CAN DENY A COMMON LAW CITIZEN HIS PRIVILEGE AND RIGHT TO A COMMON LAW JURY TRIAL WHEN THAT SAME COMMON LAW CITIZEN RESERVED HIS SEVENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT FROM THE VERY FIRST ACT OF FILING HIS COMPLAINT AND NEVER THEREAFTER WAIVING THAT RIGHT.

II. WHETHER THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS CAN ACT CONTRARY TO ITS OWN RULES AND FRAP RULES AND BY SO DOING CONFUSE AND DEFEAT FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT OF PETITIONER

LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

IN THE COURT WHOSE JUDGEMENT IS SOUGHT TO BE

REVIEWED

MITCHELL E. BRANNEN, PRO SE, PETITIONER
4149 COLT RD.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31405

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, RESPONDENT *
400 MALL BLVD.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31406

UNION CAMP CORPORATION, RESPONDENT
LATHROP AVE.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31401

B. AVANT EDENFIELD,
JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
P.O. BOX 9865
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31412

* THIS LIST COMPRISES THOSE PARTIES

LISTED IN CAPTION OF ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE WAS REPRESENTED BY

U.S. ATTORNEY

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

WHOSE JUDGEMENT IS SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED

MITCHELL E. BRANNEN, PRO SE , PETITIONER
4149 COLT RD.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31405

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, RESPONDENT*
400 MALL BLVD.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31406

UNION CAMP CORPORATION, RESPONDENT
LATHROP AVE.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31401

B. AVANT EDENFIELD, RESPONDENT
JUDGE U.S. DISTRICT COURT
P.O. BOX 9865
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31412

JUDGES,
FAY, ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

HENDERSON, ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

HATCHETT, ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

* REPRESENTED BY U.S. ATTORNEY

ABOVED NAMED PARTIES ARE THOSE OF PROCEEDING
FOR PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS IN
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

WHOSE JUDGEMENT IS SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED

MITCHELL E. BRANNEN, PRO SE, PETITIONER
4149 COLT RD.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31405

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, RESPONDENT *
400 MALL BLVD.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31406

UNION CAMP CORPORATION, RESPONDENT
LATHROP AVE
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31401

B. AVANT EDENFIELD, RESPONDENT
JUDGE, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
P.O. BOX 9865
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31412

JUDGES,
RONEY, ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

HENDERSON, ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

HATCHETT, ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

* REPRESENTED BY U.S. ATTORNEY

A REFERENCE TO OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL
REPORTS OF ANY OPINIONS DELIVERED IN THE COURTS
BELOW

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT:
JUDGEMENT IN A CIVIL CASE:
CASE NO. 485-222
DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 1985

COURT ORDER:
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT:
CASE NO. 485-222
DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1985

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT:
LETTER TO COUNCEL OF RECORD:
SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY STATUS CONFERENCE:
DATE: SEPTEMBER 4, 1985

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT:
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS DENIED:
DATE: JANUARY 9, 1986
CASE NO. 85-8881
CAPTION: IN RE: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT:
PETITION FOR REHEARING DENIED:
DATE: FEBRUARY 28, 1986
CASE NO. 85-8881
CAPTION: IN RE: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT:
NOTICE: DOCKET FEE
CASE NO: 86-8247
CAPTION: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN-v-I.R.S. et al
DATE: APRIL 10, 1986

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT:
COURT ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL FROM UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT:
CAPTIONED: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN
V
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
UNION CAMP CORPORATION and
JUDGE B. AVANT EDENFIELD
CASE NO. 86-8247
DATE: APRIL 29, 1986

NOTE: PETITIONER HAS LISTED THE RULINGS OF BOTH FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT AND ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT AS WELL AS LETTERS ECT. THAT WERE SENT REGARDING THE INSTANT CASE. PETITIONER KNOWS OF NO OTHER REPORTS OFFICIAL OR OTHERWISE.

STATEMENT TO INVOKE JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

I

JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS INVOKED IN THAT ACTION OF FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT CONCERNING SEVENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO COMMON LAW JURY TRIAL IS AT ISSUE

II

JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS INVOKED IN THAT ACTION OF UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IS AT ISSUE AS TO THE MANNER IN WHICH PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS WAS ATTENDED.

III

ON SEPTEMBER 23, 1985 A COURT ORDER WAS ISSUED DISMISSING ORIGINAL COMPLAINT OF PETITIONER. THE ORDER WAS FILED SEPTEMBER 25, 1985 AND INSTRUCTED THE CLERK TO CLOSE THE FILE. A HEARING ON ORIGINAL COMPLAINT WAS NEVER HEARD.

IV

THERE HAVING NEVER BEEN A HEARING ON ORIGINAL COMPLAINT, NO MOTION FOR REHEARING WAS MADE. COURT CLERK WAS ORDERED TO CLOSE FILE CONCERNING INSTANT CASE.

V

ON JANUARY 9, 1986, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT DENIED PETITIONER WRIT OF MANDAMUS.

ON FEBRUARY 28, 1986, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS DENIED PETITIONER MOTION FOR REHEARING ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS.

VI

STATUTORY LAW BEING DEFINED AS LAW CREATED BY LEGISLATURE, PETITIONER RELIES ENTIRELY ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO TRIAL BY COMMON LAW JURY AS UPHELD AND PRESERVED BY THE SEVENTH AMENDMENT. AS FOR ACTION OF UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE WOULD PLACE RIGHT TO DESIGNATE ISSUE TO BE HEARD IN HANDS OF PETITIONER. (continued on next page)

UNITED STATES CODE
TITLE 28
RULE 1651 (a) THE SUPREME COURT AND ALL COURTS ESTABLISHED BY ACT OF CONGRESS MAY ISSUE ALL WRITS NECESSARY OR APPROPRIATE IN AID OF THEIR RESPECTIVE JURISDICTIONS AND AGREEABLE TO THE USAGES AND PRINCIPLES OF LAW.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND REGULATIONS
WHICH CASE INVOLVES.

I. UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
SEVENTH AMENDMENT
IN SUITS AT COMMON LAW, WHERE THE VALUE IN CONTROVERSY SHALL EXCEED TWENTY DOLLARS, THE RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY SHALL BE PRESERVED, AND NO FACT TRIED BY A JURY, SHALL BE OTHERWISE RE-EXAMINED IN ANY COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, THAN ACCORDING TO THE RULES OF THE COMMON LAW.

II. UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
FIRST AMENDMENT
CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW...(THAT WOULD PROHIBIT THE RIGHT)..TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.

III. UNITED STATES CODE
TITLE 28
* RULE 2072 "..SUCH RULES SHALL NOT ABRIDGE, ENLARGE OR MODIFY ANY SUBSTANTIVE RIGHT AND SHALL PRESERVE THE RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY AS AT COMMON LAW AND AS DECLARED BY THE SEVENTH AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION.

* PETITIONER INVOKES ENTIRE RULE 2072 OF TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

A STATEMENT OF CASE MATERIAL TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED

PETITIONER INSISTS COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE DENIED PETITIONERS RIGHT TO TRIAL BY COMMON LAW JURY TRIAL.

THE MANNER IN WHICH ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HANDLED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS RESULTED IN CONFUSING PETITIONER AS WELL AS COMPROMISING PETITIONERS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT.

BASIS FOR FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE:

REVIEW OF THE ACTION OF A FEDERAL COURT IS SOUGHT IN THIS CASE AND THE BASIS FOR FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE IS THAT FEDERAL COURTS HAVE JURISDICTION OVER MATTERS WHICH CONCERN FEDERAL INCOME TAX AND TORT WHERE TORT INVOLVES THE COLLECTING OF FEDERAL INCOME TAX.

PURSUANT TO RULE 21 (1.J)
U.S. SUPREME COURT RULES

I

ESPECIALLY IN THE CASE WHERE A PETITIONER ACTS IN HIS OWN BEHALF IN THE COURTS, IT NATURALLY FOLLOWS THAT HE WOULD ACT IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD MOST SERVE HIS INTENT TO REACH A SOLUTION IN ANY GIVEN CASE THAT WOULD BE OF THE HIGHEST BENIFIT TO HIS CAUSE. IN ORDER TO REACH THIS GOAL THE PETITIONER WOULD AT TIMES REFRAIN FROM RAISING ONE ISSUE OR ANOTHER IN ORDER TO STRENGTHEN HIS CASE OR THERE MAY BE A PETITION FOR INJUNCTION CONCERNING A MATTER WHICH PETITIONER MAY WANT DEALT WITH UNTIL ORIGINAL COMPLAINT CAN BE HEARD AND SETTLED AS IS THE SITUATION IN THIS CASE.

REGARDLESS OF WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES A GIVEN CASE MAY CONTAIN, A LAWYER, ATTORNEY, OR PRO SE HAS THE UNDISPUTABLE RIGHT TO CONDUCT HIS CASE WITH-OUT THE INTERFERENCE OF THE COURTS SO LONG AS

CONDUCTS HIMSELF AND HIS CASE IN A MANNER
REEABLE WITH PRACTICES WHICH ARE BOTH ACC-
TABLE AND PROPER.REGARDLESS OF HOW INCOM-
TENT THE PETITIONER MAY BE AS IS THE PRESENT
TITIONER, THAT PETITIONER HAS THE RIGHT TO
E HEARD ON THE MAIN COMPLAINT AS A MATTER OF
PROCESS THAT IS DUE TO HIM AS WELL AS THE
ESERVED RIGHT DECLARED IN THE SEVENTH AMENDMENT
F THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. IT FURTHER
STANDS THAT THE SEVENTH AMENDMENT CONTAINS THE
WORD "PRESERVED". BY DEFINITION, PETITIONER
DIRECTS COURT'S ATTENTION TO ITS MEANING, AND
THAT IS TO "KEEP INTACT OR UNIMPAIRED". IT IS
PETITIONER'S POSITION THAT HE HAS NEVER ABANDONED
OR WAIVED HIS SEVENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND DID
RESERVE THAT RIGHT IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE
WHEN HIS ORIGINAL COMPLAINT WAS FILED.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PURSUANT TO RULE 21 (1. J)
U.S. SUPREME COURT RULES

II

THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION PROHIBITS CONGRESS FROM MAKING A LAW WHICH WOULD PREVENT A CITIZEN FROM PETITIONING THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE. IT THEREFORE FOLLOWS THAT THE COURTS CANNOT ACT IN A MANNER THAT WOULD SERVE TO EXTINGUISH THAT RIGHT, NOR COULD A COURT WRITE A RULE, REGULATION OR CARRYOUT ANY POLICY OR PROGRAM OR CONDUCT A CASE ON APPEAL WHICH WOULD IN ANY WAY INTERFERE WITH THE PETITIONERS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE.

IN THIS PRESENT CASE PETITIONER FILED WITH THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, A PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS, WHICH WAS DENIED AS WAS HIS PETITION FOR REHEARING OF THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS.PETITIONER DOES NOT TAKE ISSUE WITH THE DENYING OF PETITION FOR WRITS BUT IN THE MANNER IN WHICH COURT CONDUCTED THE APPEAL PROCESS AS WELL AS THE WAY THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT

FAILED TO OBSERVE IT'S OWN RULES AND GUIDED THE PETITIONER INTO A STATE OF CONFUSION.

RULE 19 OF THE RULES OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT STATE IN PARAGRAPH (A) THAT THE DISTRICT JUDGE IS NOT TO BE NAMED IN ANY EXTRAORDINARY WRIT BUT THAT THE PETITION SHALL BE ENTITLED "IN RE (NAME OF PETITIONER)."

AFTER THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND PETITION FOR REHEARING OF WRIT OF MANDAMUS WERE BOTH DENIED, THUS LEADING PETITIONER TO BELIEVE HE WAS NOW ELIGIBLE TO CONTINUE TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, THE CIRCUIT COURT ISSUES THREE DOCUMENTS WHICH USE THREE DIFFERENT CIRCUIT COURT CASE NUMBERS AND ENTITLE THE CASE OR WHAT PETITIONER IS FORCED TO ASSUME IS THE CASE WITH THREE DIFFERENT TITLES AND ACTUALLY CAUSE PETITIONER TO BELIEVE CONTROVERSY TO BE HEARD IS OTHER THAN THE RIGHTS ISSUE THAT PETITIONER RAISED WITH THE SINGLE INTENT OF ARGUING THE RIGHTS ISSUE ONLY.

NO MATTER HOW SLIGHT THE INFRACTION MAY APPEAR OR HOW MILD THE CONFUSION THE CONDUCT OF THE CIRCUIT COURT MAY APPEAR TO BE, THE RIGHT TO BE HEARD BEFORE A COMMON LAW JURY IS YET PRESERVED AS DOES THE FIRST AMENDMENT DECLARE THROUGH THE RIGHT TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE. IF ANY COURT CAN SO CONDUCT ITSELF IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO CAST THE SLIGHTEST BIT OF CONFUSION OR COMPROMISE ITS OWN RULES IN THE DISCHARGE OF ITS DUTY, THEN WE HAVE SOMETHING LESS THAN WHAT OUR CONSTITUTION RESERVES FOR ITS CITIZENS AND SOMETHING MORE AKIN TO THE KINGS STAR CHAMBER. THE SUPREME COURT CASE (SOUTH CAROLINA VS. UNITED STATES, 199 U.S. 437, 448)(1905) BEST SUMS PETITIONER'S POSITION "THE CONSTITUTION IS A WRITTEN INSTRUMENT. AS SUCH, IT'S MEANING DOES NOT ALTER. THAT WHICH IT MEANT WHEN IT WAS ADOPTED, IT MEANS NOW ".

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

APPENDIX:
PURSUANT TO RULE 21 K (SUPREME COURT RULES)

(1) IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE A COURT ORDER WAS ISSUED AND FILED IN THE FEDERAL COURT CLERKS OFFICE DATED SEPTEMBER 25, 1985. THE SIGNATURE DATE AT BOTTOM OF ORDER WAS SEPT. 23, 1985.

CAPTION: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN

PLAINTIFF,

V.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
AND UNION CAMP CORPORATION

DEFENDANTS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 485-222

ORDER

THE COURT HAVING PREVIOUSLY ENTERED AN ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S "PETITION FOR INJUNCTION", AND IT APPEARING THAT THIS COURT LACKS JURISDICTION TO GRANT THE RELIEF WHICH THE PLAINTIFF SEEKS IN HIS COMPLAINT, IT IS THEREFORE

ORDERED THAT THIS ACTION STANDS DISMISSED. THE CLERK IS DIRECTED TO CLOSE HIS FILE.

THIS 23 DAY OF SEPT. 1985.

ORDER WAS SIGNED BY JUDGE B. AVANT EDENFIELD
JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

CONTINUING WITH RULE 21 K(i)
SUPREME COURT RULES

(i) A LETTER FROM THE CHAMBERS OF JUDGE B. AVANT EDENFIELD DATED SEPT. 4, 1985, THE SUBJECT OF WHICH WAS , PRELIMINARY STATUS CONFERENCE AND WAS DIRECTED TO COUNSEL OF RECORD

CAPTION: CASE NO. CV 485-222
MITCHELL BRANNEN V.
I.R.S. et al

NOTE: IT IS THIS LETTER WHICH PETITIONER ALLEGES GAVE HIM TO BE ASSURED OF A HEARING ON ORIGINAL COMPLAINT WHICH NEVER MATERIALIZED.

(ii) DECISION OF UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
NO. 85-8881
IN RE: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN,
PETITIONER
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FILE DATE
JAN 9, 1986
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS DENIED.

BEFORE FAY, HENDERSON AND HATCHETT, CIRCUIT JUDGES.

BY THE COURT:
THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS IS DENIED.
THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS FILED IS TREATED AS A TIMELY NOTICE OF APPEAL AND IS HEREBY

TRANSMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA FOR DOCKETING.

continuing with 21K (11)

(11) DECISION OF UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
NO. 85-8881
IN RE: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN,
PETITIONER
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FILE DATE
FEBRUARY 28, 1986
PETITION FOR:
REHEARING OF WRIT OF MANDAMUS DENIED
BEFORE RONEY, HENDERSON, AND HATCHETT, CIRCUIT JUDGES.
BY THE COURT:
APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REHEARING, TREATED

AS A MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE ORDER OF

JANUARY 9, 1986 IS DENIED.

(11) LETTER FROM CLERK OF UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS:
DATED APRIL 10, 1986
CAPTIONED NO. 86-8247
MITCHELL E. BRANNEN -V- I.R.S., et al
CV 485-222- DIST. CT. NO.

LETTER CONTAINED INSTRUCTIONS TO ORDER TRANSCRIPT
AND PAY FILING AND DOCKETING FEE
NOTE: THERE WAS NEVER A HEARING ON ORIGINAL COMPLAINT
THEREFORE THERE WAS NO TRANSCRIPT.
ALSO CASE NUMBER (86-8247) UP UNTIL PRESENT WAS

UNKNOWN TO PETITIONER AND LED PETITIONER TO BELIEVE
A CHANGE IN CIRCUIT COURT NUMBERS WOULD MEAN A
CHANGE IN ISSUES TO BE HEARD ON APPEAL AND ONLY
ISSUE PETITIONER HAD WAS IN RE: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN.

CONTINUING WITH RULE 21 K (11)
U.S. SUPREME COURT RULES

(11) DECISION BY UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
NO. 86-8247
CAPTION: MITCHELL E. BRANNEN,
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT

VERSUS

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, UNION
CAMP CORPORATION AND JUDGE B. AVANT
EDENFIELD,
DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

CLERK'S OFFICE:

PURSUANT TO CIRCUIT RULE 16(B), THE APPEAL
WAS DULY ENTERED DISMISSED FOR WANT OF PRO-
SECUTION FOR FAILURE OF APPELLANT TO PAY
FILING FEES WITHIN THE TIME FIXED BY THE
RULES, THIS 29TH DAY OF APRIL, 1986.

SIGNED BY IRENE HENDRIX
DEPUTY CLERK

May 23, 1986
Mitchell E Brannen
Pro Se

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

PURSUANT TO RULE 25 (C) FRAP

I, MITCHELL E. BRANNEN, DO HEREBY CERTIFY

THAT I HAVE SERVED A TRUE COPY OF THE FOREGOING

DOCUMENT TO ALL CONCERNED PARTIES BY PLACING THE

SAME IN THE UNITED STATES MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID.

THE FOLLOWING WERE SERVED BY CERTIFIED MAIL
EXCEPT THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY IN SAVANNAH,GA.
WHO WAS SERVED BY U.S. MARSHALL.

EDWIN MEESE III
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL
WASHINGTON D.C. 20530

HINTON R. PIERCE
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
125 BULL STREET
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31412

RANDALL K. BART
P.O. BOX 2139
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31498

B. AVANT EDENFIELD
JUDGE, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
P.O. BOX 9865
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31412

UNION CAMP CORPORATION
LATHROP AVE
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31412

CONTINUE TO NEXT PAGE...

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

JUDGES FAY
RONEY
HENDERSON
HATCHETT
THESE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT WERE MAILED THEIR COPIES (3 EACH) BY CERTIFIED MAIL.
C/O UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
50 SPRING STREET, S.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-3147

MICHAEL L. PAUP
CHIEF APPELLATE SECTION
TAX DIVISION
DEPT OF JUSTICE
P.O.BOX 502
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20044

DATED THIS 23 DAY OF May 1986

Mitchell E. Brannen

MITCHELL E. BRANNEN, PRO SE
4149 COLT RD.
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31405
PHONE 233-6269/233-5200